

Appl. No. : 08/943,356  
Filed : October 1, 1997

The specific changes to the amended claims are shown on a separate page attached hereto and entitled **MARKED UP VERSION OF CLAIMS**, which follows the signature page of the Amendment. On this page, the insertions are underlined while the [deletions are bold, in brackets].

In a telephonic conversation with Applicant's attorney, on April 19, 2001, the Examiner stated that except for the provisional rejection based on obviousness-type double patenting, Claims 1-10, 23-33, 36, and 38 were patentable over the references of record. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-10, 23-33, 36, and 38 are now in condition for allowance.

II. Discussion of Objection to Claims 21 and 22 Based on an Informality

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 21 and 22 because the claims refer to the wrong claim number. Applicant has amended Claims 21 and 22 to correctly refer to Claims 20 and 21, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Examiner's objection is now overcome.

III. Discussion of Rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 11-18, 20-22, 34-35, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,751,933 to Dev et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this basis for rejection in view of the amended claims.

With respect to both Claim 11 and Claim 20, the Examiner stated that Dev et al. teaches the invention as claimed. It is the Examiner's position that Dev et al. discloses a system which allows a user to "process further information about an alert by clicking on the corresponding device icon and alert status." However, Applicant submits that Dev et al. discloses a multifunction icon representing a network device, and that by clicking on specified areas of the icon a user can obtain further information *regarding the device* for which an alarm is registered. (Col. 15, Lines 8-14). For example, when a user clicks on an area [410] of the icon [400], a view showing status information regarding the device is provided. (Fig. 9 and Col. 14, Lines 57-58). In contrast, amended Claims 11 and 20 each recites a method of monitoring the operational status of components in a computer, the method comprising the act of "allowing a user to *selectively*

Appl. No.  
Filed

: 08/943,356  
: October 1, 1997

*disable or enable a future display of a notification by selecting or deselecting a corresponding notification type* in a graphic display.” (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere does Dev et al. teach or suggest a method that comprises the act of “allowing a user to selectively disable or enable a future display of a notification by selecting or deselecting a corresponding notification type,” as recited in each of amended Claims 11 and 20. Since Dev et al. fails to teach or suggest each element of either Claim 11 or Claim 20, Dev et al. does not anticipate either Claim 11 or Claim 20.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 11 and 20 are both patentable over the references of record. Claims 12-19, 34, and 37 each depends either directly or indirectly from Claim 11. Claims 21, 22, 34, and 35 each depends either directly or indirectly from Claim 20. Therefore, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4, Claims 12-19, 21, 22, 34, 35, and 37 each incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claims from which they respectively depend. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 12-19, 21, 22, 34, 35, and 37 are also patentable.

### CONCLUSION

The Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner’s concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims for patentability purposes, the reasons therefore, and arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is specifically requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 5/2/01

By: 

John M. Carson  
Registration No. 34,303  
Attorney of Record  
620 Newport Center Drive, 16<sup>TH</sup> Flr.  
Newport Beach, CA 92660